

between those two documents, and we have done our best to work with them. This action that we have taken now to lift the spending caps will give us the opportunity to work out the differences with the administration. I do believe that should and can be completed today. It is my firm hope we will complete action on the other two bills today so the House may commence consideration of them tomorrow and that the Senate will consider them Friday. That, of course, is going to take a lot of understanding and cooperation from all Members of the Senate, and I for one urge that take place.

I have not been home since the first week of August. We, on the Appropriations Committee, have been working around the clock on this process since the second week of August. It is time this come to an end. The disputes and conflicts between the bills, and between the administration and the Congress, between the House and Senate, and between Members of each body and within each body, are the most intensive I have ever seen. But it is time we realize that at the end of this week we will be 1 week away from the elections. I do not think Congress ought to be in session in the week before the elections, and I am going to do my utmost to see that we finish these bills by Friday.

If that is not possible, the leader will have to decide what we do. I, for one, intend to go home Saturday.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business. Senators are to be recognized for up to 5 minutes each.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLITICS AND ELECTIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, there is so much happening in the world of politics and elections, it is almost hard to know what topic to talk about. Education is certainly No. 1 on the agenda of the American people, and we are now in the final stages, I hope, of agreeing—I am hopeful—on an education bill for our country. We have made some good progress. I am very glad; it appears President Clinton's budget priority for afterschool programs is winning out. I am hoping that is the case.

Many of us have worked long and hard to make the point that afterschool care is crucial, that it is the

best antidote to high crime, juvenile crime that occurs in the afternoons after school. It is a no-brainer. We know if kids are kept occupied after school, it keeps them out of trouble. We have seen these programs work. We have seen that juvenile crime occurs between 3 and 6 p.m. If children are engaged in stimulating activity after school, it helps.

President Clinton and the Democrats have been trying to ensure that the 1 million children who are waiting for afterschool programs, in fact, get afterschool programs. After reading press reports, I am glad to report to my colleagues that this looks as if it is on the way. However, we still have a major disagreement on school construction. I have seen some of our schools that are falling apart. Again, I hope we can reach agreement on this crucial issue.

The two candidates for President have been arguing over education. The good news is that education is the topic of the day. It is important, when we realize we have to import people to come into this country to take the high-tech jobs, and what a tragedy it is that our young people are not trained. So education is key.

Of course, there is an argument between the two candidates on whether or not education should be a national priority, which is Vice President GORE's view, or Governor Bush's view that really the National Government should not get very involved. This is a key distinction.

I side with Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican President, who said it is crucial to our national defense to have education as a top priority and to make sure that our young people are educated in math, science, and reading, everything they have to know—even in those days before high tech. I think Vice President GORE is correct.

There is also a flap over some claims that the Texas students were doing really well. It turns out that the independent Rand report issued just yesterday says, in fact, those Texas students were not tested with national tests. If one looks at the national tests, they are just not making it. Clearly, this education issue is going to go on.

I come here as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee to talk about another issue, a very important issue, and that is an issue that is being debated in the Foreign Relations Committee right now. I am not on the particular subcommittees that are holding this hearing, but it seems to me the hearing going on about U.S.-Russia policy in 1995 are really aimed at trying to take a hit at Vice President GORE.

It is interesting that Republican officials who are speaking up 2 weeks before the election never even talked about the agreement that came out of those meetings in 1995. They did not talk about them for 5 years, but 2 weeks before an election they are out there trying to hurt the Vice President. This is politics at its very worst.

Frankly, what we ought to be talking about is foreign policy in the years 2000 and 2001 in this century because some of the comments made by Governor Bush and his advisers are raising all kinds of alarms throughout the world. It is important that they be put on the table. These remarks have to do with the U.S. policy in the Balkans. Advisers to Governor Bush have followed up on his statements he made in the last debate that if he was elected President, he would negotiate for the removal of all U.S. peacekeeping troops from the Balkans. As one can imagine, this announcement has set off alarms in capitals of our European allies who rightly believe that such a policy would weaken and divide NATO.

One of the things that alarmed me about Governor Bush's comments was he said our military is really there to fight wars and win wars, not to keep the peace; that is our role. That puts our people in a very difficult position because if, in fact, we have a situation where suddenly our military is no longer involved in peacekeeping but only in fighting, then I think our NATO allies will say: OK, you do the fighting, we will do the peacekeeping. And it means that our troops will be in harm's way and our pilots will be in harm's way. This is a great concern to me.

According to today's New York Times, Lord Robertson, the NATO Secretary General, has regularly told visiting American Congressmen that the Bush proposal could undermine the whole idea of risk sharing, which is precisely the glue that holds our alliance together.

The Washington Post quotes one European Ambassador saying:

If the U.S. says it will not perform certain tasks, then the basic consensus of "all for one and one for all" begins to unravel. . . . The integrated military command could fall apart and so would [our] alliance.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mrs. BOXER. I will be happy to yield as long as I do not lose time and do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Senator from California.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 4:30 p.m. today, provided that the Senate has received the papers, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the 1-day continuing resolution, and no amendments or motions be in order, and that the Senate proceed to an immediate vote on final passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I just want to find out if this was cleared on our side.

Mr. ENZI. This was cleared on both sides.

Mrs. BOXER. Then I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. In light of this agreement, the first vote today will occur at 4:30 p.m.

I thank the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

POLITICS AND ELECTIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Let me take us back from before the unanimous consent request was made and kind of summarize where I was going.

We had a statement by Governor Bush. The statement was that he wanted to see all of those peacekeeping troops come home from the Balkans. He said we should not be involved in peacekeeping, only in fighting. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am concerned and clearly our NATO allies are concerned. Lord Robertson, the NATO Secretary General, again, has said this could undermine our relationship with our NATO alliance.

The Washington Post says one European Ambassador was quoted as saying: If the U.S. says it will not perform certain tasks, then the basic consensus of NATO begins to unravel.

Now, I remember being very surprised, because I was at the second debate, when Governor Bush made the point that we were carrying the load in the Balkans in terms of the peacekeeping troops. I knew that was incorrect. The fact is, American troops are no more than 20 percent of the total. American aid represents no more than 20 percent of what is being provided to Bosnia and Kosovo.

I would hate to see us walk away from peacekeeping and tell everyone we are the fighters; and then have our allies say: OK, you do the fighting; we do the peacekeeping. It is of great concern to me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some editorials that have been written on this subject by the New York Times, the Washington Post, and USA Today.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 24, 2000]

RISKING NATO

Gov. George W. Bush wants a new "division of labor" within NATO, the U.S.-European alliance that has helped keep the peace for the past half-century. His proposal would more likely lead to a division of NATO itself—to the end of the alliance.

Mr. Bush hinted at this view before, with his denunciation of U.S. "nation-building" in the Balkans, but it was his national security adviser, Condoleezza Rice, who spelled out exactly what he means in a New York Times interview published Saturday. Ms. Rice said that America's allies in Europe should furnish the ground troops for missions such as peacekeeping in Kosovo and Bosnia, while the United States should offer "the kind of

support we can provide, such as air power." In other words: You Europeans take all the risks while we hover safely above the fray. No allies would long accept such a deal, nor should they be expected to.

The proposal is particularly misguided given that European allies already are bearing the brunt of peacekeeping duties in the Balkans. They provide about four-fifths of needed troops. The United States has deployed some 11,000 troops in Kosovo and Bosnia, less than one percent of its active duty force. For the United States, this is a win-win situation: Its policy is implemented, but the burden of implementation is widely shared. Under Ms. Rice's proposal, which was officially endorsed by Bush campaign headquarters, the United States would lose its ability to steer policy, risk the world's most successful alliance—and very likely inherit a far larger burden once the Balkans erupted again.

The Clinton Administration has picked an unfortunate argument in response. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, again to the Times, said that even raising the issue was dangerous to U.S. interests. This recalls the Gore-Lieberman campaign's contention that Mr. Bush's criticism of U.S. military readiness is dangerous because it comforts U.S. enemies. This effort to squelch debate is preposterous; these are precisely the kinds of issues that should be aired in a campaign.

The more sensible response would be to point out that the Clinton-Gore policies seem to be having an effect. The Balkans are at peace; democracy is sprouting almost everywhere; even the apparently invulnerable Slobodan Milosevic has been knocked from his perch. Of course many problems remain, the gains are fragile and, yes, U.S. troops will be needed for some time. But surely helping democracy take root throughout Europe is worth the modest price of that modest deployment.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 24, 2000]

NO TIME FOR A BALKAN EXIT

Sharp contrasts emerged over the weekend in the way the Bush and Gore campaigns view America's proper military role in Europe. The debate began when Condoleezza Rice, one of Gov. George W. Bush's leading foreign policy advisers, told The Times's Michael Gordon that a Bush administration would ask European members of NATO to gradually take over full responsibility for providing peacekeeping forces for Bosnia and Kosovo. Vice President Gore countered that carrying out such a policy could destabilize the Balkans and jeopardize the future of NATO, America's most important military alliance.

Debates over how and where United States military forces should be stationed are a healthy part of presidential contests. Ms. Rice's proposal is consistent with the Bush campaign's view that extended peacekeeping missions degrade the combat readiness of American military forces and that the Pentagon should concentrate its resources on preparing for crises where Washington alone has the might to deter, and, if necessary, combat aggression, whether in the Persian Gulf, the Korean Peninsula or a future military conflict in Europe.

But on the specifics of America's role in the Balkans, Ms. Rice's proposal is misguided for several reasons. The job of securing peace in Bosnia and Kosovo is far from complete. The American share of the peacekeeping has already been substantially reduced. Finally, the NATO alliance has been built on a concept of shared risk that is inconsistent with a total withdrawal of American ground forces from Balkan peacekeeping.

It is true that military conditions in Bosnia are now more stable than they were when NATO troops were first introduced five years ago and that the situation in Kosovo has also improved in the year since Serbian forces withdrew. But in neither place is there yet enough security for displaced refugees to return to their homes or for elections to take place without the risk of physical intimidation. The departure of Slobodan Milosevic from Yugoslavia's presidency creates new opportunities for easing tensions in both Bosnia and Kosovo, provided local troublemakers can be kept in check. That will require a continued strong NATO presence.

The Clinton administration, meanwhile, has done a good job of insisting that America's share of peacekeeping responsibilities be steadily reduced. There are now only 11,400 American troops in the Balkans, about one-fifth of the NATO total. When NATO first went into Bosnia, about a third of its 60,000 troops were Americans. Balkan peacekeeping costs account for just over 1 percent of the Pentagon's \$280 billion budget, leaving more than enough for military needs elsewhere.

Asking Europe to accept a total withdrawal of American ground forces from the Balkans needlessly challenges some of the basic assumptions of the Western military alliance. NATO was formed not just to counter Soviet bloc military threats. It was also designed to eliminate some of the historic military rivalries in Europe that led to two world wars. NATO provides a framework for European and American forces to cooperate in joint operations under a single overall commander—traditionally an American. Europe cannot be expected to accept an alliance in which Washington exercises political and military leadership but does not subject its own forces to any of the risks of ground operations. The Bush campaign is right when it insists that the United States must be selective in where it stations ground forces. But the Balkans is not the place to cut back.

[From the USA Today, Oct. 24, 2000]

BUSH TAKES UNWISE STEP AWAY FROM PEACEKEEPING

TODAY'S DEBATE: U.S. AND EUROPE

OUR VIEW: FOR THE U.S. TO LEAD NATO, IT MUST PARTICIPATE

Most Americans want to see their country as a world leader, but they are unenthusiastic about the human and financial costs of doing what may be necessary to lead. So it's no surprise that both presidential candidates have treaded carefully on defining America's future role in peacekeeping.

But during the weekend, the Bush campaign refined its position in a way that's likely to win votes while weakening the United States' leadership role in Europe.

In a proposal that plays into the public's ambivalence, George W. Bush's senior national security aide, Condoleezza Rice, suggested that a Bush administration would tell NATO that Europeans should take over peacekeeping in the Balkans. The U.S. would focus instead on potential trouble spots where it alone can act, she said, such as the Persian Gulf and the Taiwan Straits.

Her remarks were an effort to flesh out Bush's repeated theme that U.S. forces should focus on the ability to fight wars, not what he derides as "nation building." It's appealing logic to a country that has never been enthusiastic about long-term foreign commitments. But it is rooted in the dubious assumption that the United States can effectively lead NATO, the West's primary defense alliance, without being a full player.

Both the recent history of the Balkans and the longer-term history of Europe say that is shortsighted.